

How can rural community-engaged health services planning affect sustainable health care system changes? - A process description and qualitative analysis of data from the Rural Coordination Centre of British Columbia's Rural Site Visits Project

C Stuart Johnston, Rural Co-ordination Centre of British Columbia, Canada

Erika Belanger, Rural Co-ordination Centre of British Columbia, Canada

Krystal Wong, Rural Co-ordination Centre of British Columbia, Canada

David Snadden, University of British Columbia Faculty of Medicine Northern Medical Program, Prince George, BC, Canada.

Abstract

Objectives

The objectives of the Rural Site Visit Project (SV Project) were to develop a successful model for engaging all 201 communities in rural British Columbia, Canada, build relationships and gather data about community health care issues to help modify existing rural health care programs and inform government rural health care policy.

Design

An adapted version of Boelen's health partnership model was used to identify each community's Health Care Partners: health providers, academics, policy makers, health managers, and community representatives. Qualitative data was gathered using a semi-structured interview guide. Major themes were identified through content analysis, and this information was fed back to the government and interviewees in reports every six months.

Setting

The 107 communities visited thus far have health care services that range from hospitals with surgical programs to remote communities with no medical services at all. The majority have access to local primary care.

Participants

Participants were recruited from the Health Care Partner groups identified above using purposeful and snowball sampling.

Primary and secondary outcome measures

A successful process was developed to engage rural communities in identifying their health care priorities, whilst simultaneously building and strengthening relationships. The qualitative data was analysed from 185 meetings in 80 communities and shared with policy makers at governmental and community levels.

Results

36 themes have been identified and three overarching themes that interconnect all the interviews, namely Relationships, Autonomy and Change Over Time, are discussed.

Conclusion

The SV Project appears to be unique in that it is physician led, prioritizes relationships, engages all of the health care partners singly and jointly in each community, is ongoing, provides feedback to both the policy makers and all interviewees on a 6-monthly basis and, by virtue of its large scope, has the ability to produce interim reports that have helped support system change.

Article Summary

- This study process has adapted Boelen’s health partnership model and is unique in that it is physician led, prioritizes relationships, engages all of the health care partners singly and jointly in each community, is ongoing, provides feedback to both the policy makers and all interviewees on a 6-monthly basis.
- A successful method of engaging with rural communities and building relationships and trust across multiple stakeholder groups is described that contributed to influencing positive health care system changes.
- As all communities in one province are being visited a picture of rural health care initiatives and challenges is highly comprehensive and therefore able to influence policy.
- One of the main limitations in this study is that because the interviewers were experienced health care providers, power differentials may have existed which may have introduced bias in the discussions.
- A potential limitation is the enormous amount of data to handle and analyze in a rigorous way, which was mitigated by having two full time analysts working together to ensure consistency with frequent meeting with the research team to consider and agree emerging themes.

1 How can rural community-engaged health services planning affect sustainable health care
2 system changes? – A process description and qualitative analysis of data from the Rural
3 Coordination Centre of British Columbia’s Rural Site Visits Project

4
5 **Introduction**

6 British Columbia (BC), Canada, has a population of approximately 5 million. About fourteen
7 percent (631,776) (1) are rural citizens distributed unevenly over an area of 944,738 km². BC is
8 geographically diverse with a broken 27,000 km coastline and extensive mountain ranges that
9 make for long and often dangerous travel, complicated at times by wildfires, floods, avalanches
10 and harsh winter conditions. Access to health care services for rural citizens is often limited by
11 the expansive geography, provider availability (2) and transportation issues (3).

12 Support programs for rural physicians in BC are overseen by the Joint Standing Committee on
13 Rural Issues (JSC), a committee comprised of equal numbers of provincial Ministry of Health
14 representatives and rural physicians. The JSC manages approximately C\$150M (2020) of
15 funding annually for programs and projects that improve health care delivery in rural BC ([JSC](#)
16 [Program Booklet](#)). Some of this work is delivered by the Rural Coordination Centre of BC
17 (RCCbc), which is funded by the JSC to coordinate and improve rural health care throughout the
18 province.

19 The Rural Site Visits Project (SV Project) was initiated in 2017 by rural physicians with a proposal
20 to the JSC who tasked the RCCbc with visiting 201 rural and Indigenous BC communities
21 identified as eligible for rural benefits under the [Rural Practice Subsidiary Agreement \(RSA\)](#). The
22 RSA is an agreement between the Government of BC and the [Doctors of BC](#) (a professional
23 organization that represents 14,000 physicians, medical residents and medical students in BC).

24 The purpose of the SV Project was to build relationships between rural physicians, health care
25 providers, health administrators, municipal leadership, First Nations leadership, first
26 responders, academia and policy makers through listening and gathering data systematically
27 about local successes, innovations and challenges relating to rural health care delivery. This
28 data is guiding the development of JSC programs and informing government Rural Health Care
29 policy.

30 In 1978 the declaration of the Alma-Ata International Conference on Primary Health Care stated
31 that: “The people have the right and duty to participate individually and collectively in the
32 planning and implementation of their health care” (4). Current trends in rural health services,
33 however, aim to reduce infrastructure and support to achieve greater efficiencies through
34 centralization of services (5, 6). Small rural communities have had to be proactive in securing
35 local health services to resist this development (7, 8), requiring improved relationships and
36 communication between the policy makers and communities.

37 Community participation has been seen as a more complete approach to health development
38 (9) leading to culturally and contextually appropriate decisions being made about rural health
39 services (10, 11). Relationship building between stakeholders is also seen as more effective
40 than attempting to provide a myriad of health care services (12, 13), especially as each rural
41 community is unique and “one size fits all” approaches are largely ineffective (6, 14). While
42 there have been efforts by health service policy makers to align their actions with rural
43 communities’ expressed priorities (15, 16), the processes used for community engagement
44 have received less attention (17) and descriptions seldom include adequate documentation of
45 the processes involved (17, 18).

46 The community engagement literature does not show examples of rural health projects
47 initiated and led by physicians, even though physicians have been key partners in other
48 research on rural community-engaged health services planning (15). Much of the research on
49 community engagement in rural health service planning has had a specific focus, for example in
50 improving immunization programs in Nigeria (17) or chronic disease care in the Torres Strait
51 Islands (13). There are some examples of research focused on community participation for
52 broader primary care reform, for example, in the Northern Health Authority region of BC (15)
53 and the Remote Service Futures (RSF) Project in Scotland (10, 12, 16). The former has resulted
54 in some sustained changes to date, for example the establishment of Primary Care Nurses,
55 improved antenatal care and regional palliative care services (15). When the RSF outcomes
56 were reviewed in 2014: “Only one direct sustained service change was found” (19). These raise
57 the question of how best to affect sustainable beneficial rural health system changes using
58 community engagement processes. The project described here attempts to address this issue.

59

60 **Design & Methods**

61 Theoretical Approach

62 The Health Partnership model described by Boelen (20) was used. This identifies five partners:
63 health professionals, academic institutions, policy makers, health managers and citizens and
64 recommends they meet to identify ways to improve health systems. The concept of meeting
65 with the partners together in each community was modified to include additional separate
66 meetings with each of the partners. Who constituted the health partners could be different in

67 each community, so the concept was adapted to the local context to include those present in
68 the community. This could include others such as first responders, business and non-profit
69 groups. It was not possible to have combined partner meetings in all communities as it was not
70 always possible to find a date and time withing the visits time line that worked for everyone.
71 The interviews incorporated an Appreciative Inquiry approach (21, 22) with intentional listening
72 using a semi-structured interview guide. The interviews focused on how rural community
73 members perceived health care delivery within their respective communities seeking successes
74 and innovations as well as challenges. To process the large volume of qualitative data collected,
75 qualitative content analysis (23) was used.

76 Patient and Public Involvement

77 Public input into the research project occurred during the initial pilot Site Visits to eight rural
78 communities.

79 Public input was used to shape the community engagement process and the interview guide.

80 The initial interview guide was developed by the investigators, who had many years of rural
81 health care experience, to elicit broad discussion about multiple health care issues. The guide
82 was refined based on public and provider input during pilot visits. The interview format
83 continued to be iteratively improved based on feedback from subsequent Site Visits.

84 Persons representing the health care partner groups in each community were recruited initially.
85 Snowball recruitment was then used to include other valuable perspectives.

86 Participants were asked for feedback on the interview process and whether the time taken was
87 appropriate.

88 Every six months a Community Feedback Report is circulated to all past interviewees in which
89 the latest results are discussed. The report is in the public domain and dissemination is
90 encouraged.

91 Site Recruitment

92 The sites identified for the SV Project were the 201 communities identified under the RSA.

93 Arranging Site Visits

94 Sites are selected six to twelve months in advance. Three to six months prior to a Site Visit,
95 recruitment of participants commences and RCCbc staff coordinate the planning. Depending on
96 community size and location site visits last one to three days and involve one to five
97 communities.

98 Site Visits Team

99 A Site Visits team consists of at least one Site Visitor and one RCCbc staff member, who
100 coordinates the visits. The Site Visitors comprise 19 rural physicians and one midwife. A one-
101 day training session for interviewers included training in Appreciative Inquiry techniques and
102 qualitative interviewing and cultural safety through the [San'yas Indigenous Cultural Safety](#)
103 [Training course](#). Site Visitors were individually mentored by the Program Leads on their first
104 visits. On some Site Visits guests are invited. The purpose of inviting a guest is to assist urban-
105 based allies in their understanding of how health care functions in small rural communities.

106 Guests have included policy makers, researchers, health care workers, administrators, and
107 educators.

108 Participant Recruitment

109 The study population included participants who identified themselves as living or working in an
110 RSA community and were part of one or more of the partner groups identified by Boelen (20).

111 Participants were recruited using purposeful and snowball sampling (23) through the following
112 methods:

- 113 • Email and phone contact through publicly available information
- 114 • Recruitment posters in doctors' lounges, hospitals, clinics, and municipal buildings
- 115 • Contacting pre-existing contacts who provide connections to potential participants
- 116 • Asking participants to suggest others who fit the inclusion criteria

117 Initial contact was made by telephone or e-mail with a follow-up invitation that detailed the
118 project background, aims and goals and included a copy of the interview guide and consent
119 form. Participants were invited to participate in one-on-one interviews or focus groups (if there
120 was more than one person from an identified health partner group) and dates established.

121 Interviews took place in the communities, however since March 2020, eleven virtual interviews
122 have been trialed as a result of Covid-19 restrictions.

123 Data Collection

124 Each health partner group (between one and sixteen participants) was interviewed separately.

125 This was followed by a combined partner focus group (between two to ten people) with a

126 representative from each of the health partner groups previously interviewed. A semi-
127 structured interview guide was used which has been iteratively refined following community
128 visits, in keeping with standard qualitative methods. The guide was informed by Appreciative
129 Inquiry and public input in order to build relationships and to better understand how rural
130 community members perceive health care delivery within their respective communities
131 including health care successes, innovations and challenges that inhibit their ability to access
132 services in an equitable manner. Interviews were recorded digitally and transcribed. Interviews
133 generally lasted one hour. Transcripts were returned to participants within four weeks for
134 verification, alteration, or withdrawal if requested.

135 Data Analysis

136 NVivo 12 (QSR International) was used to help organize the data. Initially each interview was
137 coded using an inductive-approach and primary cycle coding (23). This began with a close
138 reading of the data, assigning words or phrases that captured the essence of each sentence.
139 From this a codebook was developed, and second level codes were generated to identify
140 emerging themes across the data. Throughout the entire analysis process data was revisited to
141 allow for the comparison and modification of codes to fit new incoming data.

142

143 Rigor was maintained throughout by a second data analyst. Analysts coded identical interviews
144 separately and then compared coding to promote consistency. Analysts met weekly to discuss
145 changes and modifications needed for the coding framework. The coding framework and

146 emerging analysis was discussed and agreed within the research team. The data was further
147 interpreted to identify themes connecting the data across communities (23).

148 Knowledge Translation

149 Emerging themes are disseminated to policy makers, physicians, allied health professionals,
150 First Nations, municipality members, academics, and the general public through various
151 knowledge translation outputs such as a six-monthly JSC and publicly available [community](#)
152 [feedback reports](#) and newsletters, specialized (focused) reports, presentations, briefing notes,
153 and publications. Additionally, an [Innovations website](#) has been established to share successful
154 innovations identified by interviewees.

155 **Ethics**

156 The study received harmonized ethics approval from the Behavioral Research Ethics Board of
157 the University of British Columbia. Operational approval was also received from each health
158 authority. Informed consent is collected from all participants.

159 **Results**

160 Site Visits Engagement Process

161 Although the Covid-19 pandemic has significantly slowed down the project, 382 interviews have
162 been carried out in 107 communities over a three-year period (Table 1). The first 4 site visits to
163 9 communities with 23 interviews were used to pilot and develop the methods and were not
164 included in the analysis reported here which is based on 185 interviews with 754 participants in
165 80 communities. The data from the remaining 27 site visits are in process of transcription,

166 returning transcripts to participants and analysis. As the data is well saturated and the
 167 processes take several months it seems appropriate to report the study now.

168 **Table 1 Partner groups and numbers of interviews**
 169

Health Partner Groups	Definition	Number of Interviews Analyzed	Number of Pilot Interviews Analyzed
Health Administrators	Health Services Administrators, health managers, hospital/clinic managers	36	4
Physicians	Majority were family physicians, but also includes residents, specialists and hospitalists	52	6
Municipal / Community Members	Mayors, Councilors, Regional District Directors and members, health organizations/societies	34 (municipal) 4 (community)	5
First Nations	First Nations Band members, elders, Chiefs, health directors, community health representatives, nurses, health coordinators	29	2
Nurse Practitioners*	Nurse practitioners (could also include students)	7	0
Midwives*	Midwives (could also include students)	4	0
First Responders*	Fire Chiefs, paramedics, community paramedics	1	0
Academics*	Clinical professors, clinical teachers, clinical researchers, medical school professors.	2	0
Combined Partners (group meeting)	Leads (or representatives/proxy's) of each health partner group such as the Mayor, hospital Chief-of-Staff, First Nations health director, fire chief.	16	6
Total number of interviews		185 (interviews analyzed to date not including pilot interviews)	23 (pilot interviews analyzed for primary codebook development)

170 .

Number of RSA Communities visited	80
Number of interviews analysed	185
Number of participants	754

171

172

173 Across interviews collectively, one participant withdrew their transcript. Many participants
174 provided feedback; highlighting their enjoyment of the direct, in-person engagement process
175 that was used and the connections they provided:

176 *“I think this has been very informative. Just getting to know what you guys do...and [the]*
177 *supports [that exist] and establishing connections and...learning about these connections that*
178 *exist that I haven’t tapped into personally so, it’s great.” – Combined Partners*

179 Participants further described how they felt the process allowed for their voices to be heard,
180 and their communities to be recognized:

181 *“I appreciate being able to talk...and to give frank feedback because that is tough at times and*
182 *this is a good option to do it...some of our issues aren’t really out there right? So, it’s good to be*
183 *able to have a voice to be able to indicate this.” – Nurse Practitioner*

184 *“I want to thank you for recognizing us a ‘rural,’ because a lot of people don’t see us as rural.”*
185 *– First Nations*

186 It was commonly voiced by participants that, throughout the engagement process, they’d love
187 to learn about what other communities have achieved.

188 *“Would love to see information about other initiatives going on around other provinces that*
189 *they might be able to learn from.” – Combined Partners*

190 *“[We] would like to receive feedback about how [we] work with other communities and what*
191 *works well in other communities.” – Combined Partners*

192 These requests from participants ultimately led to the creation of the Site Visits [Innovations](#)
193 [website](#).

194 **Site Visits Themes**

195 The data has become well saturated with 36 categories emerging from the data to date. The
196 ten most common themes are presented briefly to provide context (Table 2), and these will be
197 the subject of subsequent publications. This article reports three overarching themes that
198 interconnect all the data: Relationships, Autonomy and Change Over Time.

199

200 Table 2: Rural Site Visits Project Table 2: List of Top 10 Themes

201

Themes	Definitions
Areas of Opportunity	Areas of health care that provide an opportunity to be changed or improved upon within reason. Examples range from old & damaged waiting rooms (infrastructure) to miscommunication between two or more stake holding bodies (relationship building).
Support	Areas in which direct support or additional support is requested by any health care partner in any area.
Transportation	All methods of transportation utilized by community members for local and long-distance transport. This section includes specific methods, thoughts, successes and challenges related to local transportation, emergency transportation, accessing areas far away (distance) and environmental factors/conditions.
Successful Initiatives	Initiatives such as measures, models, programs, methods, or systems that have created a beneficial impact in improving the health care and/or health service delivery of a community.
Population	Health and non-health related (i.e. community events) aspects of a population that relate to a community's population growth, recruitment, and retention
Health Authorities	Any reference to interactions with a communities HA and/or to assistance, successes, challenges brought upon a community through their HA. May also include information regarding communities that declare the presence/absence of their ties with their HA.
Scope of Practice & Workload	The entire role that physicians and/or other health professionals encompass as a rural health care provider. This may include general and or specific skill sets that are required from individuals in a given community. Other concepts included in this section are physician expectations (from self and others), physician wellbeing, and physician burnout (associated with heavy workloads, lack of time off, etc.).
Finance	Various methods of billing, funding resources, and pay models for physicians within a community. Demonstrates the variety of financial models (both successful and inadequate) utilized within communities.
Services	Any health-related service that is at risk of becoming extinct or in need because that service is (1) currently not available in the area and (2) currently in significant demand by patients and health providers.
Patient Capacity & Attachment	Information relating to wait-times for services, family physician availability, or number of beds available within a hospital setting. Includes accounts relating to patient attachment and how patients are attached/unattached in a community.

202

203 Relationships

204 Relationships were important in achieving successful health care outcomes and were built on
205 communication, trust, transparency and collaboration over time. These themes were evident in
206 every community:

207 *“It’s really groups of people coming together on committees that have people from city council,*
208 *the regional district, health boards, and the non-profit societies...and I think if there’s a strength*
209 *in this community, it’s that there are those connections and people are willing to work together*
210 *to find solutions locally.” – Combined Partners*

211 Good relationships underpinned communities’ abilities to successfully retain their physicians.
212 These relationships were with the communities themselves as well as with administrators and
213 within teams:

214 *“Why do you think they’ve stayed here?” – Interviewer*

215 *“[It’s] the relationship that they [the physicians] maintain with the community...It all*
216 *comes down to the relationships.” – Municipality*

217 *“When we went to [Health Authority X] to say, ‘We’re having a terrible time retaining our*
218 *doctors,’ - the turnover was terrible - we got no response from the system. So, the community*
219 *rallied around and did what was necessary to sustain doctors in this community. But in doing*
220 *that what we did was create relationships with our physicians that are respectful and goes*
221 *[both] ways.” – Community Members*

222 Effective communication and regular “organic” contact were the foundation of these
223 relationships and were important in building trust:

224 *“Having all the different services all in the one building does allow for good open
225 communication, you can pull anyone aside if you bump into them in the hallway to talk about
226 patients. It is a very organic process rather than a formalized team-based care approach. ... It
227 also helps retain people who work here – you build that relationship and trust of what your
228 peers are capable of. It’s not formal team-based care, but it is a team.” – Combined Partners*

229
230 *“There needs to be trust and consistency of knowing what someone is walking into. Issues of
231 trust [have been] a major block in [our] community to providing and receiving health services.”
232 – Health Admin*

233 Successful collaborations that were inclusive of all partners positively impacted health care and
234 helped reduce burnout:

235 *“It makes it much easier working [here], because I’ve worked here a really long time with
236 [colleagues X and Y] it makes it much easier when we have a group that all works together
237 really well. And that doesn’t happen everywhere. [We] are all friends so [we] tend to help each
238 other out... being [without them] ...the burnout would be terrible.” – Physicians*

239 *“It’s really groups of people coming together on committees that have people from city council,
240 the regional district, health boards, and the non-profit societies that identify the problems and
241 look at what each particular group...can provide to try to deal with the problem and...it’s those*

242 *connections and people [who] are willing to work together to find solutions locally.”*

243 *– Combined Partners*

244 Conversely, poor collaboration and relationships led to adverse consequences:

245 *“...when I meet with my doctors, I hear one thing about what the problem is and how to solve it.*

246 *And then, if I talked to nurses or midwives or allied health professionals, I hear another version*

247 *of what the problem is and how we would fix it. And then I sit down with [Health Authority X]*

248 *and I hear their version of what the problem is and that they are fixing it. And all those voices*

249 *are never in the same room at the same time...” – Municipality*

250 Good relationships enhance problem solving, reduce the ‘red tape’ required to affect change

251 and result in greater work satisfaction at all levels, positively affecting other issues such as

252 recruitment, retention, and burnout. Local decision making (autonomy) was an important

253 contributor to work satisfaction.

254 Autonomy

255 Autonomy within the health care context was defined in many ways. However, at its core many

256 viewed autonomy as the ability to make reasonable decisions, sensitive to the local context, at

257 a personal or local level that did not require the blessings of a hierarchical, top-down system.

258 The latter stifled initiative, innovations, and satisfaction.

259 A sense of autonomy within the health care providers appears to improve recruitment and

260 retention. It imbued a sense of greater ‘ownership’ of, or responsibility for, the local services by

261 the community practitioners:

262 *“Part of it is the relationship that they maintain with the community...Dr [X] has come to the*
263 *council and has asked for extra room to bring in more medical professionals, and the city*
264 *worked with him so that he can have the space to have another professional help out his team.*
265 *The main thing is working with them and letting them grow, not dictating to the doctors.”*
266 *– Municipality*

267 The data described a disconnect between centrally directed processes and what was practically
268 achievable in a community:

269 *“...I think there’s kind of an issue sometimes with delivery of rural health care in that people*
270 *actually in the trenches doing the job have a much better insight sometimes into what needs to*
271 *be done and what is happening than the people making the decisions about how we’re going to*
272 *deliver the health care.” – Physicians*

273 The most frequent plea was that more local engagement was needed to solve local problems
274 and how important local autonomy was in crafting enduring solutions:

275 *“I couldn’t believe that – ‘we are bringing more resources and that’s not working for you?’*
276 *What didn’t happen is there was no consultation, so it didn’t really matter if we brought more*
277 *resources. It was like, ‘you didn’t ask us what our problem is, what we need and what is our*
278 *reality and you’re just bringing resources and that’s not how we want this to look like...”*
279 *– Health Admin*

280 *“...locally it feels like our concerns are profoundly dismissed by the health authority, who clearly*
281 *have a different idea and a different agenda” ... “We need to be kind of at least a largely*
282 *autonomous community.” – Physicians*

283 When consultation occurred a very different attitude existed among the health care providers:

284 *“...So, we took that learning and stepped back and took one whole year to do focus group and to*
285 *follow staff to understand what they're doing, what are the challenges, the issues, to*
286 *understand better the population that we serve...involving physicians along the way and after*
287 *we've done all of this, we came up with another model, not really with much more budget...but*
288 *it wasn't about the budget anymore and we've presented the model to the staff in March and*
289 *since then, we are implementing the new model and it's working and people are just following*
290 *along the process and I think that there's a lot of learning about the history of the community*
291 *and how we need to do things here.” – Health Admin*

292 Local autonomy meant the ability to make rapid operational decisions on the day. Many small
293 rural communities had extraordinary stories of unbroken 24/7 emergency coverage for many
294 years provided by the local practitioners despite being reduced to a single physician at times.
295 Similarly, nurses in small rural hospitals frequently did additional shifts to cover gaps when their
296 colleagues were unable to work. These providers felt a responsibility to maintain these services
297 in their community:

298 *“I had a lot of autonomy about who I could hire...and so I had the ability to hire locally and so I*
299 *built a big pool of people who lived here who were very committed to [the] Healthcare Centre.”*
300 *– Health Admin*

301 When control of these services was elevated to a higher level outside of the community, this
302 loyalty was reduced as local autonomy was lost, contributing to Emergency Room coverage
303 gaps and difficulty filling nursing shifts:

304 *“...So now we have one GP who is keeping the whole system going through being on call 24*
305 *hours a day, 7 days a week. So, it’s sort of a step backwards, and I think a lot of it is just that*
306 *we’ve lost the autonomy to be able to kind of say, “Well, this is what our community needs. This*
307 *is how we can go about solving this problem.” – Physicians*

308 *“...you’ve done a really innovative thing in adjusting your nursing lines...this is the first*
309 *community we have not heard [about] nursing shortages.” – Interviewer*

310 *“So, we need to start developing our rotations to make it attractive for those nurses to*
311 *come...We’re one of the few rural sites that have full staffing now.” – Health Administrator*

312 One example of a successful model is a 3-year trial in a region where a Health Authority granted
313 three geographically close rural communities the autonomy to determine their priorities for
314 improving local health care, and provided funding to support these changes:

315 *“We had a series of engagement events for the entire community, health care providers, public,*
316 *youth at one of the high schools, our Indigenous population, and the [Community X Group] and*
317 *said, where would you like to spend \$500,000 on services and so 5 things came to the top...”.* –

318 [RCCbc Video](#)

319 Autonomy as defined by the local ability to make relevant health care decisions, runs through
320 all the data as a foundational theme in supporting system improvement.

321 Change Over Time

322 “Change over time” is a prominent contextual factor that underpins all the themes within the
323 SV Project to date. One of the biggest changes over time has been the change in community

324 population. Some remote and resource-based communities reported diminishing populations,
325 however, this was much less common than those reporting increased population growth due to
326 young families leaving cities to find affordable housing and retirees moving in. In addition, there
327 is a growing tourism load in many communities. These factors, exacerbated by the expectations
328 of care for those that have moved into the community, have impacted resources and funding
329 for longstanding residents:

330 *"...a lot of communities are struggling with what to do with a very quickly growing, aging*
331 *population...we have a very strong in-migration of young families..." – Municipality*

332 *"[Our] patient population has increased... [and the] infrastructure has not changed."*
333 *– Physicians*

334 *"...communities in [Region X] have been shrinking since forestry work has moved [away from*
335 *Region X]."* – Municipality

336 Participants emphasized how demographic and population changes have created local concerns
337 that the community services are not adapted to the changing contexts; thereby causing issues
338 that relate to capacity, patient access, staffing, service demands, manpower, and funding that
339 do not meet the communities' needs:

340 *"...our community is growing, like our nation is growing, but the services haven't. And so,*
341 *everyone's fighting for a doc..." – First Nations*

342 *"I think we're just lacking that vision for the hospital in what is a basic level of service to serve a*
343 *growing community of 21,000 that also supports 2-3 communities north of us."* – Municipality

344 *“...And trying to actually keep up from a staffing perspective, from a staff retention, everything*
345 *from a budget, like it’s we are playing a really hard game of catch-up because it’s growing*
346 *faster than we can even account for and put in services to meet the needs. That’s what I think*
347 *the biggest challenge is...” – Health Admin*

348 Rural communities are dynamic and, because of their size and isolation, particularly vulnerable
349 to changes, which may not be easily anticipated. Change is continual and only those that have
350 the ability to find ways to adapt are able to continue to deliver effective health services.

351

352 **Discussion**

353 The Site Visit Project has strengths in the degree of its engagement and, after engaging with
354 107 rural communities and conducting 382 interviews, it has shown that it is possible to collect
355 large volumes of data about local health care issues in a systematic and meaningful way in
356 order to influence provincial health service changes. The fact that the Site Visits team travels to
357 each community appears to have a strong influence on the relationships and trust experienced
358 in the interviews. Many of the interviewees have informally commented on this fact, noting
359 that they feel that the Site Visits team now understands their remoteness, available services,
360 difficulties with transporting patients etc., and that they feel ‘heard’. One limitation of this
361 project is that it was carried out in British Columbia and supported by adequate resourcing
362 through negotiated public funds allocated through the provincial physician organization. This
363 means that it is specific to the context of British Columbia but may have elements transferable

364 to other settings. It would only be possible to replicate this project with sufficient funding
365 supports.

366 The major themes are being identified and the analyzed data shared as specialized reports to
367 both the micro and macro policy maker levels, connecting them in a manner that is resulting in
368 some early systemic changes. Emergency transportation is one [example](#) where the provincial
369 government have recently announced further rural emergency transport resources. The
370 processes described have implications for policy makers in terms of rural health, ones that can
371 be adapted to different contexts.

372 The three themes described in this article appear as patterns throughout the data set. They are
373 interlinked and can be seen as foundational elements for effective functioning of health care
374 services in rural communities. Good relationships between providers, health authority
375 administration, external specialist services and community members were repeatedly identified
376 as being responsible for high functioning, successful communities. This means that effort needs
377 to be made to create the time and space to develop relationships and that these efforts are
378 valued by all sectors. Part of the importance of relationships was linked to the concept of
379 autonomy which in this sense meant the ability to make local decisions when needed.

380 Autonomy impacted both the sense of wellbeing of the partners, but could also produce very
381 practical, rapidly implemented changes with positive results, for example in the community of
382 [Hope](#). The exercise of autonomy however can be problematic if not carried out within an
383 agreed framework that requires the limits of decision making to be set and agreed with health
384 service administration and which recognizes historical power differences in health care (15, 24).

385 Finally, change over time is recognized as being an important contextual factor in the provision

386 of services to small rural communities and the resilience of these communities seems related to
387 their ability to adapt to often unexpectedly changing circumstances. Such adaptation would
388 appear to be easier in a context of good relationships and an agreed approach to local
389 autonomy.

390 There are many examples in the literature of community engagement, though the literature
391 does not appear to contain any examples of such widespread engagement being used to
392 support policy change at a provincial level. The SV Project benefited from the fact that it is
393 purely about listening. It did not promise change, but rather that the information gathered
394 would inform change. Using Boelen’s Health Care Partners model at micro and macro levels
395 (20), the results of the SV Project are being used to discuss contextually appropriate changes for
396 rural health care. Having all the partners present at these discussions appears to increase the
397 chances of producing successful and sustainable outcomes. The findings fit within the “five
398 rules of Large System Transformation” described by Best et al (25) and illustrate that rural
399 health care is a complex adaptive system. While this study does not attempt to explore
400 complexity, it does offer a framework for engagement and data gathering that is sensitive to
401 complexity and local contexts and may point to an example of the paradigm shift Greenhalgh
402 and Papoutsis call for in their editorial on studying complexity in health services research (26).

403

404 **Limitations**

405 Not all partner groups existed or were available to meet in some communities. The latter was
406 rare and virtual meetings were arranged when necessary.

407 Because the Site Visits teams were led by experienced health care providers, a power
408 differential existed during the interviews which may have been inhibitory, particularly when
409 interviewing Indigenous groups.

410 As the interviews were led by health care providers it is possible that they may have biased the
411 discussions.

412 The data collected is specific to the geography, health system and rural context of BC and may
413 not be fully transferable to other settings.

414 A potential future limitation may be disengagement by the communities from further site visits
415 if there no beneficial changes are seen to occur.

416 **Conclusion**

417 By modifying Boelen's approach to partnership in health development the SV Project has
418 demonstrated a successful way to engage rural communities and gather extensive data that can
419 be used to inform rural health care policy in an ongoing and contextually appropriate manner.

420 Relationships, communication and relevant data are the cornerstones that successful
421 sustainable change is built on.

422 While every rural community is different, this project elicited many common themes that have
423 linked the health care issues in rural BC. Although early changes have already occurred, further
424 research will be needed to determine whether the changes resulting from the SV Project are
425 beneficial and sustainable with time.

426 **Funding**

427 This project is supported by funds from the Joint Standing Committee on Rural Issues through
428 funding negotiated through the Ministry of Health and Doctors of BC's Physician Master
429 Agreement. Those funds are administered by the Rural Coordination Centre of BC.

430 **Data Sharing**

431 Due to the confidential nature of the interview data the raw data is not publicly available. All
432 interim reports and innovations are available through public websites and links are embedded
433 in the body of the text.

434 **Competing Interests**

435 Stuart Johnston is funded as a Director of the RCCbc. Erika Belanger and Krystal Wong are full-
436 time employees of the RCCbc. David Snadden was the Inaugural Rural Doctors' University of
437 British Columbia (UBC) Chair in Rural Health from 2016 to 2020, which is supported by an
438 endowment to the UBC from the Rural Doctors' of BC through the JSC. He also sits on the RCCbc
439 Leadership group to provide an academic perspective. He is fully funded by the Faculty of
440 Medicine at UBC as a Professor of Family Practice. There are no other competing interests.

441 **Author Contributions**

442 Stuart Johnston is the project lead, has been involved in all stages of the project design, has
443 attended visits and has helped with data analysis. He wrote the first draft of the article.

444 Erika Belanger is the primary analyst and developed the analytic methodology, the codebook
445 and the initial content analysis. She has attended visits and contributed to all sections of the
446 article.

447 Krystal Wong developed the Site Visits processes, attended visits, has been involved in all
448 conversation in terms of the analysis and contributed to all sections of the article.

449 David Snadden developed the qualitative methodology and guided the research methodology,
450 assisted with analysis and determining themes and contributed to all sections of the article
451 including developing and editing the final pre-submission draft.

452

453 Acknowledgements

454 We would like to thank the entire RCCbc Site Visits Project team for helping with the
455 administrative coordination and reach out to communities throughout the duration of this
456 work. We would also like to thank Gemma McEachern for providing key supports during the
457 initial phases of this project and Anne Lesack for assisting with the data analysis throughout this
458 project. We would like to further extend our thanks to Dr. Martha McLeod and Jason Curran for
459 providing us with an external review and feedback on our manuscript. Thank you to the Joint
460 Standing Committee for funding this work and allowing us to continue this project.

461 Most importantly, we wish to acknowledge all our participants who chose to welcome us to
462 their communities and allowed us to listen to their experiences and perspectives. We thank you
463 for participating in this work and contributing your voices.

464

465 Word Count, 4877 for main text

466

467

468 **References**

469

- 470 1. Population and Dwelling Count Highlight Tables, 2016 Census Ottawa: Statistics Canada; 2016
471 [Available from: [https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/hlt-fst/pd-](https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/hlt-fst/pd-pl/Table.cfm?Lang=Eng&T=703&SR=1&S=87&O=A&RPP=25&PR=59&CMA=0&CSD=0#map-popup)
472 [pl/Table.cfm?Lang=Eng&T=703&SR=1&S=87&O=A&RPP=25&PR=59&CMA=0&CSD=0#map-popup](https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/hlt-fst/pd-pl/Table.cfm?Lang=Eng&T=703&SR=1&S=87&O=A&RPP=25&PR=59&CMA=0&CSD=0#map-popup).
- 473 2. Supply, Distribution and Migration of Physicians in Canada 2018: Data Tables Ottawa: Canadian
474 Institute for Health Information; 2018 [Available from:
475 <http://indicatorlibrary.cihi.ca/display/HSPIL/Proportion+of+Physicians+in+Rural+Areas>.
- 476 3. Hanlon N, Halseth G. The greying of resource communities in northern British Columbia.
477 *Canadian Geographer*. 2005;49(1):24.
- 478 4. Declaration of Alma-Ata International Conference on Primary Health Care 1978; Alma-Ata USSR:
479 World Health Organisation.
- 480 5. Teja B, Daniel I, Pink GH, Brown A, Klein DJ. Ensuring adequate capital investment in Canadian
481 health care. *CMAJ*. 2020;192(25):E677-E83.
- 482 6. Sullivan L, Ryser L, Halseth G. Recognizing Change, Recognizing Rural: The New Rural Economy
483 and Towards a New Model of Rural Service. *Journal of Rural and Community Development*.
484 2014;9(4):219-45.
- 485 7. Hanlon N, Macleod ML, Reay T, Snadden D. Partnering for Health Care Sustainability in Smaller
486 Urban Centres: Why and How a Health Authority Chose to 'Go Upstream'. In: Halseth G, Markey S, Ryser
487 L, editors. *Service Provision and Rural Sustainability*. First Edition ed. New York: Routledge; 2018. p. 80-
488 95.
- 489 8. Nel E, Connelly S. Rural health service delivery challenges in an era of neoliberalism in New
490 Zealand. In: Halseth G, Markey S, Ryser L, editors. *Service Provision and Rural Sustainability*. New York:
491 Routledge; 2019. p. 65-79.
- 492 9. Mahmud S. Citizen Participation in the Health Sector in Rural Bangladesh. *IDS Bulletin*.
493 2004;35(2):7.
- 494 10. Nimegeer A, Farmer J, Munoz SA, Currie M. Community participation for rural healthcare design:
495 description and critique of a method. *Health Soc Care Community*. 2016;24(2):175-83.
- 496 11. Petersen I, Baillie K, Bhana A, Mental H, Poverty Research Programme C. Understanding the
497 benefits and challenges of community engagement in the development of community mental health
498 services for common mental disorders: lessons from a case study in a rural South African subdistrict site.
499 *Transcult Psychiatry*. 2012;49(3-4):418-37.
- 500 12. Farmer J, Philip L, King G, Farrington J, Macleod M. Territorial tensions: misaligned management
501 and community perspectives on health services for older people in remote rural areas. *Health Place*.
502 2010;16(2):275-83.
- 503 13. Davy C, Cass A, Brady J, DeVries J, Fewquandie B, Ingram S, et al. Facilitating engagement
504 through strong relationships between primary healthcare and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander
505 peoples. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*. 2016;40(6):535-41.
- 506 14. Kenny A, Hyett N, Sawtell J, Dickson-Swift V, Farmer J, O'Meara P. Community participation in
507 rural health: a scoping review. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2013;13:64.

- 508 15. MacLeod MLP, Hanlon N, Reay T, Snadden D, Ulrich C. Partnering for change: How a health
509 authority, physicians and communities work together to transform primary healthcare services. *J Health*
510 *Organ Manag.* 2019;34(3):255-72.
- 511 16. Farmer J, Nimegeer A. Community participation to design rural primary healthcare services.
512 *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2014;14:130.
- 513 17. Hammanyero KI, Bawa S, Braka F, Bassey BE, Fatiregun A, Warigon C, et al. Lessons learnt from
514 implementing community engagement interventions in mobile hard-to-reach (HTR) projects in Nigeria,
515 2014-2015. *BMC Public Health.* 2018;18(Suppl 4):1306.
- 516 18. Farmer J, Taylor J, Stewart E, Kenny A. Citizen participation in health services co-production: a
517 roadmap for navigating participation types and outcomes. *Aust J Prim Health.* 2017;23(6):509-15.
- 518 19. Farmer J, Currie M, Kenny A, Munoz SA. An exploration of the longer-term impacts of
519 community participation in rural health services design. *Soc Sci Med.* 2015;141:64-71.
- 520 20. Boelen C. *Towards Unity for Health: Challenges and Opportunities for Partnerships in Health*
521 *Development.* Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organisation, WHO/EIP/OSD/2000.9; 2000.
- 522 21. Carter CA, Ruhe MC, Weyer S, Litaker D, Fry RE, Stange KC. An appreciative inquiry approach to
523 practice improvement and transformative change in health care settings. *Qual Manag Health Care.*
524 2007;16(3):194-204.
- 525 22. Whitney D, Trosten-Bloom A. *The Power of Appreciative Enquiry: a Practical guide to Positive*
526 *Change.* 2nd ed. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler; 2010.
- 527 23. Patton MQ. *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods: Integrating Theory and Practice.*
528 *Fourth Edition ed.* Thousand Oaks, California: Sage; 2015.
- 529 24. Snadden D, Reay T, Hanlon N, MacLeod M. Engaging primary care physicians in system change -
530 an interpretive qualitative study in a remote and rural health region in Northern British Columbia,
531 Canada. *BMJ Open.* 2019;9(5):e028395.
- 532 25. Best A, Greenhalgh T, Lewis S, Saul JE, Carroll S, Bitz J. Large-system transformation in health
533 care: a realist review. *The Millbank Quarterly.* 2012;90(3):35.
- 534 26. Greenhalgh T, Papoutsi C. Studying complexity in health services research: desperately seeking
535 an overdue paradigm shift. *BMC Med.* 2018;16(1):95.

536

537

538

539